

## CONFIDENTIAL

Since this course was broken down into lectures and various operational tasks, probably the best way to critique is to take these areas separately. Also, since the lectures came before the tasks, I shall address myself to the lectures.

As my experience with the Agency leans toward the reporting aspect of operations, I believe that my comments on this area would be the most useful. I found the instruction to be extremely good. The presentations were handled in such a way that what could be an extremely boring and tiring subject was made interesting to all. I was disappointed in one area, however. The exemplars used to show format of various types of reports were mostly outdated and in some instances incorrect. The view-graph of the pouched [REDACTED] was the one with the most inconsistencies in regard to format and usage of itmes such as Field Comments. For example, if I remember correctly, there were no parenthesis around the Field Comment that was a separate paragraph. Also, the spacing between the source description and the first paragraph of the text was incorrect (two spaces instead of the required four). It is realized that these are somewhat petty criticisms but correct format is a must in reporting.

25X1A

25X1A9a

Mr. [REDACTED] "Helpful Hints" were very helpful. They went a long way toward correcting mistakes before they became habit. I found them informative and useful in explaining areas of reporting that were vague such as which type of comment where and when.

The reporting requirements levied as a result of the various exercises were realistic. At no time did I think that we were reporting only for the sake of generating paper.

As to the thrust of the course in general, I believe that the aim was somewhat off the realistic mark. For instance, how many Chiefs of Station would allow new, inexperienced case officer to [REDACTED] of the magnitude of [REDACTED] I would imagine the total would be quite small. Therefore, I believe that more emphasis could be placed on the [REDACTED] theme. I thought that Mr. [REDACTED]'s presentation was both informative and useful. I regret that his theme could not have been expanded and used in one of the exercises. It is quite probable that most if not all of the students of this BOC will at some time in their career be faced with this type of operation. Few, if any of the students during their careers will be handling Penkovskiy and the like.

25X1A14a

25X1A2g

25X1A14a

25X1A9a

Along this same vien, I thought that there was too much emphasis on SB Division during the lecture hours. I realize that the USSR is our "main target" but most of what was said (and re-said) could have been covered in half the time. In addition, the general

CONFIDENTIAL

tone and flavor of the lectures from SB representatives was very vague and evasive. It is realized that security considerations prevented certain areas from being explored, but it is difficult to accept that they had to be as evasive as they were. It was the general opinion of many students that SB's "secrecy" was an attempt to inflate their own importance by hiding behind a screen of silence.

The Map Course could have been more effective. The programmed text was rather exasperating. The continual switching of maps tended to break up what little continuity the text contained. I believe that map reading instruction would be clearer if presented by a lecturer in conjunction with supervised practical work.

The technical training was excellent. It was clearly presented effectively demonstrated.

The operational assignments were generally good. However, I think that the first meeting with an agent should concentrate on the conduct of the meeting exclusively. Those of us who did not take the OFC were somewhat handicapped from a lack of experience in dealing with agents. Therefore, I suggest that no reporting be required for the initial face-to-face meeting. This would allow the students to concentrate on the mechanics of agent contact that will be used throughout the course.

CONFIDENTIAL